

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8

Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program

Implementation Step 2 Proposals

PIN: 9598
Applicant Name: Tahoe Resource Conservation District
Project Title: Tahoe Sierra Integrated Regional Water Management Proposal

Funds Requested: \$ 24,514,287
Total Project Cost: \$ 32,306,291

Total Proposal Score:	99
------------------------------	-----------

Description: The Tahoe Sierra Integrated Regional Water Management Proposal is a collaborative effort of fifteen partner agencies. The proposal implements a regional water management strategy. Projects include erosion control, wetland restoration, fisheries enhancement, water pipeline replacement, non-point source pollution control, water conservation and TMDL Implementation.

Question: Adopted IRWMP and Proof of Formal Adoption

4

The Tahoe Sierra Plan is an FED made up of 11 individual documents and an umbrella document. The majority of partners (11 of 15) have signed an MOU adopting the umbrella document for the 11 plans comprising the Tahoe Sierra Plan. The remaining four partners are scheduled to sign the MOU by 12/31/06. All 11 plans comprising the Tahoe Sierra Plan have previously been adopted. Hereafter, references to the "IRWMP" will represent the Umbrella Document.

Question: Description of Region

3

The Step 1 review comments stated that the applicant should have presented more detailed maps with land use and infrastructure data on a larger scale. Two maps are included in the IRWMP. The maps depict regional boundaries, watersheds, partner boundaries, and DACs to some degree. However, the maps do not include major water related infrastructure or major land use divisions. In addition, parts of the maps are labeled incorrectly and are difficult to read. Narrative descriptions of why the region is appropriate for water management, as well as descriptions of water quality, water quantity, water supply/demand, and socioeconomic makeup are included in the IRWMP. Additional details on water quality, water quantity, water supply/demand, and socio-economic makeup of the region are included in various parts of the 11 plans that make up the FED.

Question: Objectives

4

The IRWMP lists the objectives and briefly includes methods by which objectives were developed and by which conflicts can be resolved. The IRWMP succinctly identifies the regional planning objectives, and briefly describes the manner in which they were determined. The IRWMP addresses major water related objectives and conflicts in the region for each of the objective categories. The applicant should have provided greater insight into the methodology of categorization for full credit.

Question: Water Management Strategies and Integration

5

The applicant provides tables in Section D of the IRWMP that cross-reference the water management strategies with page numbers and citations from the FED. The applicant categorizes the water management strategies in relation to the regional objectives. The IRWMP considers all 20 of the water management strategies. Only desalination and imported water are irrelevant to the regional objectives. Section E of the IRWMP addresses the integration of these strategies, and cites several examples from the region.

Question: Priorities and Schedule

5

The IRWMP does a good job of breaking the objectives down into short- and long-term priorities based on the previously defined objectives. The IRWMP provides a description of the potential responses to implementation of projects and regional changes for different scenarios.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Tahoe Resource Conservation District

Question: Implementation

4

The IRWMP provides a table outlining the implementation status for each project. However, references in the table to the 11 supporting documents are difficult to follow. The IRWMP briefly describes each project's status in the table, but it does not detail studies supporting the project or technical feasibility. The timeline provided is broad. A brief discussion of the institutional structure for IRWMP implementation is provided.

Question: Impacts and Regional Benefits

5

The IRWMP breaks down the projects, links them with the objectives being addressed, and discusses benefits and potential negative impacts. The benefits have three categories: resource benefits, interregional benefits, and DAC benefits. The IRWMP also includes a discussion of benefits on a regional scale, and shows which benefits can only be accomplished by regional solutions. A discussion of the impacts and benefits to other resources is also included in the IRWMP.

Question: Technical Analysis and Plan Performance

5

The IRWMP provides a discussion of the current scientific studies and data gathering in the region and provides examples of current methodologies for monitoring water quality, etc. Data gaps are addressed, and there is a discussion of monitoring systems and measures to evaluate performance data.

Question: Data Management

5

The IRWMP includes a description of a statewide database already in place that serves as a regional data clearinghouse. Although its original intent was to serve the Lake Tahoe watershed, the database will be expanded to encompass the region. This database currently supports the data needs of several major statewide initiatives including TMDLs, SWAMP, and GAMA. Data management and public access to the data are described. Current water quality and water supply monitoring, including data gaps, for each watershed is described.

Question: Financing

4

The IRWMP provides a table of project partners and the funding requested for the associated projects. The IRWMP provides a broad summary of financing, including the in-kind and matching funds, but lacks detail. Additional description of ongoing support and funding for O&M costs should be provided.

Question: Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability

4

The IRWMP includes a water management strategies table to support the relationship to local planning and sustainability. The IRWMP summarizes coordination with local land-use planning decision makers with a list of coordination and development meetings. However, a more detailed discussion of how the local planning documents relate to the IRWM water management strategies is missing.

Question: Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination

4

Stakeholders are identified in the IRWMP. The stakeholder participation process and influence in water management decisions are described. Specific outreach and facilitation of continued stakeholder outreach during IRWMP implementation are described. Partnerships developed during the planning process, EJ concerns, and involvement/benefit to DACs is discussed. Potential obstacles to plan implementation and coordination with State and federal agencies are discussed. However, the IRWMP should discuss public outreach activities in greater detail along with mechanisms to involve stakeholders during implementation.

Weighted IRWMP Total Score: 26

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Tahoe Resource Conservation District

Question: Work Plan

9

The work plan includes goals and objectives, a brief abstract for the projects, maps showing project locations, and a brief discussion of synergies and linkages. There is a discussion of each project's project status. Some project plans and specs do not agree with the work plan. Plans for the fish hatchery interpretive center were included. However, only one project with signed plans and specs is identified. Overall, it appears they have completed limited construction plans and environmental compliance requirements.

Question: Budget

3

The applicant includes a rollup budget along with project specific budgets for the projects. The budget generally agrees with the work items, but some project budget items force the reader to return to the workplan to determine a work item. The project budgets for projects 10, 12, and 14 lacks detail and it is difficult to determine if they agree with the work plan and schedule. Some of the line items in the project budgets appear to be high (e.g. Work Item 5.1.3 "Notify SWRCB/DWR" on page 17 has a budget of \$7,000). The applicant supplies bits and pieces of supporting documentation, but it is not easily referenced back to the quoted figures in their budget.

Question: Funding Match

2

The funding match is 21.6% of the total proposal costs.

Question: Schedule

4

The schedules correspond well with the work plan items. The schedules seem reasonable. The applicant indicates that construction on several projects would start immediately after execution of contract, assumed to be May 2007. However, the schedule shows projects 6, 7, and 12 having the bulk of their work starting after December 1, 2007.

Question: Scientific and Technical Merit

12

The proposed projects are all fairly straightforward projects with the exception of Project 6 - Indian Creek Reservoir TMDL. The remaining projects have adequate levels of supporting documentation. The applicant does not specifically discuss any data gaps with the proposed projects, except for Project 5 and 7. Additional documentation should have been supplied to support full credit.

Question: Monitoring, Assessment and Performance Measures

5

The output and outcome indicators appear to be a good indication of the performance of the projects. The output indicators seem to effectively track project data collection and changes in the system. The projects appear to meet the targets within the life of the proposal.

Question: Economic Analysis

9

Overall, the benefits, primarily water quality, relative to costs are average. The water quality benefits range from medium to high, but uncertainty is high. There is no summary table of costs and benefits and the costs and benefits are dominated by Project 5 (Implement NPS BMP retrofits). A calculation error in Project 5 understates homeowner implementation costs. Other project costs, with minor corrections, are generally adequate. The corrected PV of cost for Project 5 is \$86 million. The benefit claimed is the avoided cost of a regional collection and treatment system, at an avoided cost of \$577 million (in PV). A more reasonable baseline scenario would be enforcement of the existing BMP ordinance, but with less timely compliance. Attachment 11 describes the BMP retrofit benefits in a manner that is inconsistent with the Attachment 10 monetized benefits.

Question: Other Expected Benefits

8

The proposal has a medium to high level of Other Expected Benefits. These benefits include reduced frequency and severity of flooding, increased quality and abundance of aquatic habitat, increased recreational opportunities (including fishing), reduced sediment loading, and reduced risk of fire damage/better fire suppression capabilities. However, there appears to be a moderate degree of uncertainty that the Other Expected Benefits will be realized, particularly where private property owners are expected to pay for the installation and maintenance of BMPs.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION
Tahoe Resource Conservation District

Question: Program Preferences

3

The applicant discusses how the proposal will implement multiple Program Preferences. The majority of the projects address 2 or 3 Program Preferences. However, there appears to be a less than significant degree of certainty that the program preferences claimed can be achieved. In addition, the proposal lacks thorough documentation of the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.

Question: Statewide Priorities

18

Sufficient correlation exists between the Statewide Priorities in the plan and in the proposal. A table is included that shows proposal elements and specific projects that implement Statewide Priorities and also lists the Statewide Priorities which do not apply to the proposal due to geographic location. The applicant claims that each project supports at least four Statewide Priorities. All of the projects are in targeted priority watersheds in the WMI Chapters. However, there is a limited degree of certainty that the Statewide Priorities claimed can be achieved. The applicant fails to thoroughly document the breadth and magnitude of the Statewide Priorities claimed in the application.

Total Proposal Score:	99
------------------------------	-----------